

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Little Snake Field Office
455 Emerson Street
Craig, CO 81625-1129

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

EA-NUMBER: DOI-BLM-CO-N010-2010-0022-EA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER/LEASE NUMBER: COC74169

PROJECT NAME: Powder Wash Above-Ground Gas Storage Tank/Pumping Facility

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T.11N., R.97W., sec. 5, lot 5, 6th P.M., Moffat County, CO

APPLICANT: Wexpro Company

PLAN CONFORMANCE REVIEW: The proposed action is subject to the following plan:

Name of Plans: Little Snake Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision (ROD)

Date(s) Approved: April 26, 1989

Remarks: The proposed gas storage tank/pumping facility would be located within Management Unit #2, Northern Central, (Little Snake Resource Management Plan). The objectives of Management Unit #2 are for the development of oil and gas resources. Realty actions such as rights-of-way can occur consistent with the management objectives for this unit.

Results: The proposed action has been reviewed for conformance with this plan (43 CFR 1610.5, BLM 1617.3). The proposed action is in conformance with the objectives for this management unit.

NEED FOR PROPOSED ACTION: The proposed action is needed to provide fuel for Wexpro Company vehicles and equipment working in the Powder Wash area.

PUBLIC SCOPING PROCESS: A copy of the proposed gas storage tank/pumping facility plan is on file in the Little Snake Field Office and may be viewed during regular business hours (7:45 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.), Monday through Friday, except holidays. The project is listed on the NEPA log on the Little Snake Field Office website.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES: The proposed above ground gas storage tank/pumping facility is located within the Powder Wash camp site adjacent to Moffat County Road 75. Wexpro Company has filed an application requesting a 4,000 gallon above ground gas storage tank/pumping facility. The area is located on previously disturbed surface. The proposed location is 275' from an existing water well and 32' from the employees' garage.

The proposed gasoline storage tank would be 4,000 gallon capacity, double wall steel, with remote fill and dispenser system. The location would be leveled and a concrete pad approximately 14' X 15' with a 3" rolled curb would be installed in the area of filling and dispensing. The tank pad would be approximately 8' X 11' with protective bollards in 4' centers around the tank and the remote dispense and fill area. A secondary containment is proposed around the facility. The total pad area would be approximately 15' wide and 38' long and the tank facility would be enclosed within a chain link fence. A 32' buried power line is proposed from the existing employees' garage to the gas tank. Existing roads would be used. The turnaround would be graveled with materials removed when leveling the area for the cement pads. Diversion ditches and erosion control devices would be utilized to prevent water from entering into the area.

The total surface disturbance for the proposed action would be 0.2 acre.

The grant would be for 10 years.

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE: There would be no gas storage tank and no additional surface disturbance.

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT/ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES/MITIGATION MEASURES

CRITICAL RESOURCES

AIR QUALITY

Affected Environment: There are no special designation air sheds or non-attainment areas nearby that would be affected by the proposed action.

Environmental Consequences, Proposed Action: Short term, local impacts to air quality resulting from diesel engine exhaust and dust from surface disturbing operations would result during and after the construction. The emissions from these activities consist of both gaseous and particulate fractions. Gaseous constituents from diesel engine exhaust include carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide, nitric oxide, nitric dioxide, oxides of sulfur and hydrocarbons. Fine particulates of soot from diesel exhaust and fugitive dust from operations would be localized to the project area. The health effects of these emissions are largely from long-term and occupational exposure in confined areas. The proposed action would not adversely affect the regional air quality.

Environmental Consequences, No Action: There would be no project-related impacts to air quality.

Mitigative Measures: None

Name of specialist and date: Louise McMinn 11/19/09

AREA OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN

Affected Environment: Not Present

Environmental Consequences, both alternatives: Not Applicable

Mitigative Measures: Not Applicable

Name of specialist and date: Kimberly Miller, 11/16/09

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Affected Environment: Cultural resources, in this region of Colorado, range from late Paleo-Indian to Historic. For a general understanding of the cultural resources in this area of Colorado, see *An Overview of Prehistoric Cultural Resources, Little Snake Resource Area, Northwestern Colorado*, Bureau of Land Management Colorado, Cultural Resources Series, Number 20, *An Isolated Empire, A History of Northwestern Colorado*, Bureau of Land Management Colorado, Cultural Resource Series, Number 2 and *Colorado Prehistory: A Context for the Northern Colorado River Basin*, Colorado Council of Professional Archaeologists.

Environmental Consequences: The proposed project, Powder Wash above Ground Gas Storage Tank/Pumping Facility, has not undergone a Class III cultural resource survey. The area has been heavily impacted on the surface for the duration of the Powder Wash camp's existence and no Class III survey is required. A BLM-permitted archaeologist will be required to monitor the installation of the facility.

The proposed project may proceed as described with the following mitigative measures in place.

Mitigative Measures:

A BLM-permitted archaeologist will be required to monitor the installation of the facility. The following standard stipulations apply for this project:

1. The operator is responsible for informing all persons who are associated with the operations that they will be subject to prosecution for knowingly disturbing historic or archaeological sites, or for collecting artifacts. If historic or archaeological materials are

encountered or uncovered during any project activities, the operator is to immediately stop activities in the immediate vicinity of the find and immediately contact the authorized officer (AO) at (970) 826-5000. Within five working days, the AO will inform the operator as to:

- Whether the materials appear eligible for the National Register of Historic Places;
- The mitigation measures the operator will likely have to undertake before the identified area can be used for project activities again; and
- Pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(g) (Federal Register Notice, Monday, December 4, 1995, Vol. 60, No. 232) the holder of this authorization must notify the AO, by telephone at (970) 826-5000, and with written confirmation, immediately upon the discovery of human remains, funerary items, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony. Further, pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(c) and (d), you must stop activities in the vicinity of the discovery and protect it for 30 days or until notified to proceed by the authorized officer.

2. If the operator wishes, at any time, to relocate activities to avoid the expense of mitigation and/or the delays associated with this process, the AO will assume responsibility for whatever recordation and stabilization of the exposed materials may be required. Otherwise, the operator will be responsible for mitigation costs. The AO will provide technical and procedural guidelines for the conduct of mitigation. Upon verification from the AO that the required mitigation has been completed, the operator will then be allowed to resume construction.

Name of specialist and date: Robyn Watkins Morris 11/20/09

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Affected Environment: The proposed action is located in an area of isolated dwellings. Ranching, and oil and gas exploration and development are the primary economic activities.

Environmental Consequences, both alternatives: The project area is relatively isolated from population centers, so no populations would be affected by physical or socioeconomic impacts of either alternative. Neither alternative would directly affect the social, cultural or economic well-being and health of Native American, minority or low-income populations.

Mitigative Measures: None

Name of specialist and date: Louise McMinn 11/19/09

FLOOD PLAINS

Affected Environment: Active floodplains and flood prone zones are avoided.

Environmental Consequences, both alternatives: No threat to human safety, life, welfare, or property will result from the proposed action.

Mitigative Measures: None

Name of specialist and date: Louise McMinn 11/19/09

INVASIVE, NONNATIVE SPECIES

Affected Environment: Invasive species and noxious weeds occur within the affected area. Downy brome (cheatgrass), yellow alyssum, blue mustard and other annual weeds are common along roadsides and on other disturbed areas. Canada thistle and several species of biennial thistles are known to occur in this area. Halogeton, also an annual weed has become a very noticeable problem in the affected area as well as other areas in the western portion of Moffat County. Russian knapweed and hoary cress (whitetop) have been found in the vicinity of this project. Halogeton and cheatgrass are on the Colorado C List of Noxious Weeds. Other species of noxious weeds are not known to be a problem in this area, but they can always be introduced by vehicle traffic, livestock and wildlife. The BLM, Moffat County, livestock operators, pipeline companies and oil and gas operators have formed the Northwest Colorado Weed Partnership to collaborate their efforts on controlling weeds and finding the best integrated approaches to achieve these results.

Environmental Consequences, Proposed Action: The surface disturbing activities involved would create a favorable environment for invasive species and noxious weeds to become established. Construction equipment and any other vehicles and equipment brought onto the site can introduce weed species. Wind, recreation vehicles, livestock and wildlife would be the primary vectors for weed dispersal. The annual invasive weed species (yellow alyssum, blue mustard and other annual weeds) occur on adjacent rangelands and would occupy the disturbed areas; the bare soils and the lack of competition from a perennial plant community would allow these weed species to grow unchecked. Seeding followed by successful establishment of perennial grass species would help reduce the amount of annual weeds and seed produced. When the facility is active the activity and traffic would also reduce weed growth. Halogeton would also occupy the area disturbed, but halogeton would require intensive control with herbicides to prevent it from moving into adjacent rangelands. Since vegetation and weed growth would be limited, any establishment of biennial and perennial noxious weeds that occurs should be easily detected.

When the facility is no longer needed, reclamation activities would commence. Soil and climate characteristics would favor early growing plants like Sandberg bluegrass and the annual invasive weed species, including cheatgrass. Growth of invasive annuals can reduce the success of seeding efforts. Under optimal conditions the establishment of adapted perennial grasses, other seeded plant materials and native colonizers is expected to provide the necessary control of invasive annual weeds within 2 or 3 years. Depressed areas remaining after final recontouring would increase site conditions that would be more favorable for the establishment of biennial and perennial noxious weeds. Additional seeding treatments of the disturbed areas and readjustment of the seed mixture may be required in subsequent years if initial seeding efforts have failed. Wexpro will be required

to control any noxious weeds that become established within the disturbed areas. All principles of Integrated Pest Management should be employed to control noxious weeds on public lands.

Environmental Consequences, No Action Alternative: No project-related impacts to non-native species would occur.

Mitigative Measures: None

Name of specialist and date: Louise McMinn 11/19/09

MIGRATORY BIRDS

Affected Environment: The proposed project area does not contain any suitable habitat for any species listed on the USFWS 2008 Birds of Conservation Concern List. It is unlikely that any of these species would use the project area. Chance for take to occur is very low.

Environmental Consequences, both alternatives: None

Mitigative Measures: None

Name of specialist and date: Timothy Novotny 11/20/09

NATIVE AMERICAN RELIGIOUS CONCERNS

A letter was sent to the Eastern Shoshone, Uinta and Ouray Tribal Council, Southern Ute Tribal Council, Ute Mountain Ute Tribal Council on May 26, 2009. The letter listed the FY2010 projects that the BLM would notify them on and projects that would not require notification. A follow-up phone call was performed on July 26, 2009. No comments were received (Letter on file at the Little Snake Field Office). This project requires no additional notification.

Name of specialist and date: Robyn Watkins Morris 11/20/09

PRIME & UNIQUE FARMLANDS

Affected Environment: Not Present

Environmental Consequences, both alternatives: None

Mitigative Measures: None

Name of specialist and date: Louise McMinn 11/19/09

T&E AND SENSITIVE ANIMALS

Affected Environment: There are no threatened, endangered or special status species or habitat for such species in the project area.

Environmental Consequences, both alternatives: None

Mitigative Measures: None

Name of specialist and date: Timothy Novotny 11/20/09

T&E AND SENSITIVE PLANTS

Affected Environment: There are no federally listed threatened or endangered or BLM sensitive plant species present within or in the vicinity of the proposed facility.

Environmental Consequences, both alternatives: None

Mitigative Measures: None

Name of specialist and date: Hunter Seim 11/20/09

WASTES, HAZARDOUS OR SOLID

Affected Environment: If a release does occur, the environment affected would be dependent on the nature and volume of material released. If there are no releases, there would be no impact on the environment.

Environmental Consequences, Proposed Action: Consequences would be dependent on the volume and nature of the material released. In most every situation involving hazardous materials, there are ways to remediate the area that has been contaminated. Short-term consequences would occur, but they can be remedied, and long-term impacts would be minimal.

Environmental Consequences, No Action Alternative: None

Mitigative Measures: The operator and/or contractors shall comply with all applicable Federal laws and regulations existing or hereafter enacted or promulgated. In any event, the operator and/or contractors shall comply with the Toxic Substances Control Act of 1976, as amended (15 U.S.C. 2601, et seq.) With regard to any toxic substances that are used, generated by or stored on facilities authorized under this Right-of Way (See 40 CFR, Part 702-799 and especially, provisions on polychlorinated biphenyls, 40 CFR 761.1-761.193.). Additionally, any release of toxic substances (leaks, spills, etc.) in excess of the reportable quantity established by 40 CFR, Part 117 shall be reported as required by the

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, Section 102b. A copy of any report required or requested by any Federal agency or State government as a result of a reportable release or spill of any toxic substances shall be furnished to the authorized officer concurrent with the filing of the reports to the involved Federal agency or State government.

Name of specialist and date: Shawn Wiser 11/23/09

WATER QUALITY – GROUND

Affected Environment: Potable water is in this area. The nearest domestic water well is within 275 feet and was drilled to a depth of 75 feet with a water level of 40 to 50 feet. The well is currently active.

If a release occurs, the affected environment is dependent on the volume of gasoline released. This volume would have to exceed the proposed containment system.

Environmental Consequences, Proposed Action: Environmental consequences are dependent on the volume of gasoline released. This volume has to exceed the proposed containment system.

Environmental Consequences, No Action Alternative: None

Mitigative Measures: Operator has proposed the installation of an industrial fluid containment system, a 35 mil liner and a pea gravel/cement pad. This system will exceed the recommended 110% capacity of the 4000 gallon double wall skid tank. This system complies with Colorado state government regulations and BLM recommendations.

Name of specialist and date: Marty O'Mara 11/24/09

WATER QUALITY – SURFACE

Affected Environment: The proposed project would be constructed near Ace in the Hole Draw, an ephemeral drainage. Any runoff from the area would drain towards the Ace in the Hole Draw, which drains into Powder Wash. All stream segments near the project are presently supporting classified beneficial uses. No impaired stream segments occur in the vicinity of the proposed action.

Environmental Consequences, Proposed Action: Runoff water from the project area would drain towards Powder Wash, which is an ephemeral tributary to the Little Snake River. Increased sedimentation to Powder Wash during spring runoff or from high intensity rainstorms is the most likely environmental consequence from the proposed action. Although some sediment may be transported off site and eventually reach perennial waters, the mitigation provided in the stipulations would reduce the potential impacts caused by surface runoff.

Environmental Consequences, No Action Alternative: There would be no impact to the surface water if the storage facility is not constructed.

Mitigative Measures: Holder committed measures and attached stipulations should be adequate to protect surface waters. None anticipated.

Name of specialist and date: Louise McMinn 11/30/09

WETLANDS/RIPARIAN ZONES

Affected Environment: There are no wetlands or riparian zones in or near the proposed project area.

Environmental Consequences, both alternatives: None

Mitigative Measures: None

Name of specialist and date: Timothy Novotny 11/20/09

WILD & SCENIC RIVERS

Affected Environment: Not Present

Environmental Consequences, both alternatives: Not Applicable

Mitigative Measures: Not Applicable

Name of specialist and date: Kimberly Miller 11/16/09

WSAs, WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Affected Environment: Not Present

Environmental Consequences, both alternatives: Not Applicable

Mitigative Measures: Not Applicable

Name of specialist and date: Kimberly Miller 11/16/09

NON-CRITICAL ELEMENTS

PALEONTOLOGY

Affected Environment: The geologic formation at the surface is the Tertiary Age formation, Wasatch Formation, Cathedral Bluffs Tongue (Twc), a variegated claystone, mudstone and

sandstone formation. This formation has been classified a Class II formation for the potential for occurrence of scientifically significant fossils.

Environmental Consequences, Proposed Action: Scientifically significant fossils are occasionally found within this formation (Armstrong & Wolney, 1989). The potential for discovery of significant fossils on this location is considered to be moderate. If any such fossils are located here, construction activities could damage the fossils and the information that could have been gained from them would be lost. The significance of this impact would depend upon the significance of the fossil. Ceasing operations and notifying the Field Office Manager immediately upon discovery of a fossil during construction activities can effectively mitigate this impact. An assessment of the significance is made and a plan to retrieve the fossil or the information from the fossil is developed.

The proposed action could also constitute a beneficial impact to paleontological resources by increasing the chances for discovery of scientifically significant fossils.

Environmental Consequences, No Action Alternative: None

Mitigative Measures: If fossils are discovered during construction or other operations, all activity in the area will cease and the Field Office Manager will be notified immediately. An assessment of significance will be made within an agreed time frame. Operations will resume only upon written notification by the Authorized Officer.

References:

Armstrong, Harley J. and Wolney, David G., 1989, Paleontological Resources of Northwest Colorado: A Regional Analysis, Museum of Western Colorado, Grand Junction, CO, prepared for Bur. Land Management, Vol. I of V.

Miller, A.E., 1977, Geology of Moffat County, Colorado, Colo. Geol. Surv. Map Series 3, 1:126,720.

Name of specialist and date: Marty O'Mara 11/24/09

SOILS

Affected Environment: The project area is located on soils mapped as the Tresano-Hiatha-Kandaly association, 2 to 20 percent slopes. These very deep soils are well drained and found on hills, and alluvial fans. These soils formed in alluvium derived from sandstone and shale, eolian deposits derived from sandstone. Runoff is very slow to rapid. All of the soils have a very slow to rapid permeability rates.

Environmental Consequences, Proposed Action: The construction of the project would affect soils within and immediately adjacent to the proposed area of disturbance. Increased soil erosion from wind and water would occur during construction. Loss of topsoil, soil

compaction, and possible increases in sediment loads to drainages are impacts most likely to occur.

No Action Alternative, No Action Alternative: There would not be environmental consequences.

Mitigative Measures: Additional mitigative measures would be employed to prevent or reduce accelerated erosion if it begins to occur within or on constructed drainage and diversion ditches or surface drainages.

Name of specialist and date: Louise McMinn 11/30/09

UPLAND VEGETATION

Affected Environment: The proposed facility is within a site that had a previous facility of similar character and, as a result, is devoid of any native vegetation.

Environmental Consequences, Proposed Action: The installation of this facility would not impact any existing native vegetation. It would perpetuate the existing disturbance.

Environmental Consequences, No Action: By not installing the facility, the site would be colonized by pioneer plant species, both native and exotic invasive.

Mitigative Measures: None

Name of specialist and date: Hunter Seim 11/20/09

WILDLIFE, TERRESTRIAL

Affected Environment: The proposed project area provides little value to wildlife in its current state. The Powder Wash Camp area has relatively high levels of human activities. Some wildlife may have grown accustomed to human activities and may use the area.

Environmental Consequences, Proposed Action: Individual animals which use the project area on a regular basis, are most likely habituated to human activities. Even these animals are likely to avoid the area during construction. Surrounding habitats would be sufficient to support these animals during the construction phase.

Environmental Consequences, No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts to wildlife from the No Action Alternative.

Mitigative Measures: None

Name of specialist and date: Timothy Novotny 11/20/09

AQUATIC WILDLIFE

Affected Environment: There is no aquatic wildlife habitat present in or near the project area.

Environmental Consequences, both alternatives: None

Mitigative Measures: None

Name of specialist and date: Timothy Novotny 11/20/19

OTHER NON-CRITICAL ELEMENTS:

Non-Critical Element	NA or Not Present	Applicable or Present, No Impact	Applicable & Present and Brought Forward for Analysis
Forest Management	LM 11/19/09		
Fluid Minerals		EMO 11/24/09	
Hydrology/Ground			See Ground Water
Hydrology/Surface			See Surface Water
Paleontology			See Paleontology
Range Management		JHS 11/30/09	
Realty Authorizations		LM 11/19/09	
Recreation/Transportation		KMM, 11/16/09	
Socio-Economics		LM 11/19/09	
Solid Minerals		JAM 11/20/09	
Visual Resources		KMM, 11/16/09	
Wild Horse & Burro Mgmt	LM 11/20/09		
Wildlife, Aquatic			See Aquatic Wildlife

STANDARDS:

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITY (animal) STANDARD:

The proposed project area provides little value to wildlife in its current state. The Powder Wash Camp area has relatively high levels of human activities. Some wildlife may have grown accustomed to human activities and may use the area. The proposed project area is currently not capable of meeting this standard. Both the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action would not have a negative impact on wildlife or their habitats.

Name of specialist and date: Timothy Novotny 11/20/09

**SPECIAL STATUS, THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES (animal)
STANDARD:**

There are no threatened, endangered or special status species or habitats for such species present in the project area. This standard does not apply.

Name of specialist and date: Timothy Novotny 11/20/09

**SPECIAL STATUS, THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES (plant)
STANDARD:**

There are no federally listed threatened or endangered or BLM sensitive plant species present within or in the vicinity of the proposed facility. This standard does not apply.

Name of specialist and date: Hunter Seim 11/20/09

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITY (plant) STANDARD:

There is currently no native vegetation at the site of the proposed facility. The Proposed Action would perpetuate this situation. The disturbance is highly localized and would not result in impacts to the larger plant community. In the context of the larger plant community, the Proposed Action would meet this standard.

The No Action Alternative would result in pioneer species, both native and non-native colonizing the site. Given the arid nature of the area, this condition would last for many years without direct intervention through seeding and weed control. Without active reclamation of the site, which is not part of this alternative, the No Action Alternative would not meet this standard.

Name of specialist and date: Hunter Seim 11/20/09

RIPARIAN SYSTEMS STANDARD:

There are no wetlands or riparian zones within the proposed project area. This standard does not apply.

Name of specialist and date: Timothy Novotny 11/20/09

WATER QUALITY STANDARD:

The proposed action would meet the public land health water quality standard. Reclamation of the project area would be completed immediately after installation to minimize sheet and rill erosion. Best Management Practices utilized would help to reduce accelerated erosion of the project area. No stream segments near the project are listed as impaired.

Name of specialist and date: Louise McMinn 11/30/09

UPLAND SOILS STANDARD:

The proposed action would not meet the standard for upland soils, but it is not expected to, while it is in the construction phase. Once reclamation activities commence excessive sheet and rill erosion may occur during the early succession phase of site revegetation. Reduced forage productivity due to a change in the capability of the reclaimed soil to support pre-existing plant communities is also likely in the long term. However, in the long term it is expected that a desirable plant community would be supported and the reclaimed site would meet the upland soil standard.

Name of specialist and date: Louise McMinn 11/30/09

PERSONS/AGENCIES CONSULTED: Uintah and Ouray Tribal Council, Colorado Native American Commission, Colorado State Historic Preservation Office.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)
DOI-BLM-CO-N010-2009-0039-EA

Based on the analysis of potential environmental impacts contained in the EA and all other available information, I have determined that the proposal and the alternatives analyzed do not constitute a major Federal action that would adversely impact the quality of the human environment. Therefore, an EIS is unnecessary and would not be prepared. This determination is based on the following factors:

1. Beneficial, adverse, direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental impacts have been disclosed in the EA. Analysis indicated no significant impacts on society as a whole, the affected region, the affected interests, or the locality. The physical and biological effects are limited to the Little Snake Resource Area and adjacent land.
2. Public health and safety would not be adversely impacted. There are no known or anticipated concerns with project waste or hazardous materials.
3. There would be no adverse impacts to regional or local air quality, prime or unique farmlands, known paleontological resources on public land within the area, wetlands, floodplain, areas with unique characteristics, ecologically critical areas, or designated Areas of Critical Environmental Concern.
4. There are no highly controversial effects on the environment.
5. There are no effects that are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risk. Sufficient information on risk is available based on information in the EA and other past actions of a similar nature.
6. This alternative does not set a precedent for other actions that may be implemented in the future to meet the goals and objectives of adopted Federal, State, or local natural resource related plans, policies, or programs.
7. No cumulative impacts related to other actions that would have a significant adverse impact were identified or are anticipated.
8. Based on previous and ongoing cultural surveys, and through mitigation by avoidance, no adverse impacts to cultural resources were identified or anticipated. There are no known American Indian religious concerns or persons or groups who might be disproportionately and adversely affected as anticipated by the Environmental Justice Policy.

9. No adverse impacts to any threatened or endangered species or their habitat that was determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act were identified. If, at a future time, there could be the potential for adverse impacts, treatments would be modified or mitigated not to have an adverse effect or new analysis would be conducted.

10. This alternative is in compliance with relevant Federal, State, and local laws, regulations, and requirements for the protection of the environment.

DECISION AND RATIONALE:

I have reviewed this environmental assessment including the explanation and resolution of any potentially significant environmental impacts. I have determined that the proposed action with the mitigation measures described below will not have any significant impacts on the human environment. I have determined that the proposed project is in conformance with the approved land use plan. It is my decision to implement the project with the mitigation measures identified below.

MITIGATION MEASURES: See Attached Exhibit B

COMPLIANCE PLAN(S): The project will be inspected every five for compliance with all grant terms, conditions and stipulations.

SIGNATURE OF PREPARER:

DATE SIGNED:

SIGNATURE OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWER:

DATE SIGNED:

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL:

DATE SIGNED: